

Re:

Bob Benson to: Brattin, Bill

05/16/2012 01:36 PM

From: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US
To: "Brattin, Bill" <brattin@srcinc.com>
Cc: David Berry/R8/USEPA/US@EPA

Thank you. I agree with your conclusions.

Truncating exposure at 1980 is not my idea and not very logical as fibers were still present in the facility after 1980 (at much lower levels). It is not clear whether these are residual LA fibers or fibers in the ores used after 1980. I don't think it makes any difference as a respirable fiber is likely to have the same biological effect, regardless of the ore of origin.

Truncating exposure at 1980 is going to be a recommendation in the SAB Panel's final report.

"Brattin, Bill" ---05/16/2012 01:25:43 PM---here is a summary table that has calculations based on expopsure truckated at 1980. I really do not

From: "Brattin, Bill" <brattin@srcinc.com>
To: Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: David Berry/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 05/16/2012 01:25 PM
Subject:

here is a summary table that has calculations based on expopsure truckated at 1980. I really do not see the lohic in this, and in most cases, the AIC value increases, indicating a poorer agreement between model and data.

The main conclusions are:

- 1) Monovariate models based on either Cbar or CE are MUCH worse than bivariate models that include T as an independent variable
- 2) Combining CE and T into one variable (RTW CE) is better than CE alone, but not as good as treating them separately (too bad!)
- 3) Bivariate Hill is not better than bivariate log-logistic
- 3) Cum normal model still is best

Bill Brattin
SRC, Inc.
999 18th Street, Suite 1150
Denver CO 80202
brattin@srcinc.com
303-357-3121

[attachment "Summary v3.xls" deleted by Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US]